WORKING PAPER # 268
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS SECTION
Princeton University
August, 1990

Black Immigrants to the United States:
A Comparison with Native Blacks and Other Immigrants

Kristin F. Butcher*
Department of Economics
Princeton University
August, 1990

* I am grateful to David Card for guidance and many useful suggestions. I would also like to thank Patricia Anderson, John Budd, John DiNardo, Phillip Levine, Anne Piehl, and David Zimmerman for helpful comments. Any remaining errors are mine.

Abstract

Immigrant blacks have largely been ignored, both in discussions about racial discrimination and about the assimilation of immigrants. In analyzing immigrant blacks, Sowell (1978) claims to have evidence that it is not discrimination that is responsible for the poor labor market success of native blacks, but rather their "cultural traditions." Using the 1980 Census, I find that while immigrant blacks are more likely to be employed, their wages are not different conditional on employment. To the extent that there are differences, further investigation reveals that it is the selection processes associated with migration, and not cultural traditions which account for the differences between natives and immigrants. Finally, I find that black immigrants do not have similar "assimilation" patterns to white immigrants, and there is evidence that there has been a recent decline in the quality of the immigrant cohorts.

Kristin Butcher
Princeton University
August, 1990

I. Introduction

The subject of immigration has garnered much recent attention. However, little of the analysis has focused explicitly on the immigration of blacks. Such an analysis can shed light on several controversial subjects. Thomas Sowell (1978) has argued that a comparison between black immigrants and black natives in the U.S. provides compelling evidence that discrimination is not responsible for the observed low incomes of the native-born black population. Comparing median incomes (1970 Census) of the native American blacks and immigrants from the West Indies, he found that the immigrants do very well compared to native-born blacks. Not only are their incomes higher, but in a myriad of other socioeconomic characteristics (fertility, education, crime rates) the West Indian immigrants, Sowell claims, perform better. He states that "West Indians in the U.S. are significant not only because of their over-representation among prominent or successful blacks," but also because they are a good control group for the native-born black population. Since they have the same color, but better labor market outcomes, Sowell argues that "color" or race is less important for the socioeconomic progress of blacks in the U.S. than the "cultural traditions of the American Negro." Sowell goes on to say, "Color alone, or racism alone, is clearly not a sufficient explanation of the disparities within the black population or between the black and white populations."

Sowell's conclusions may be viewed skeptically, however, as he does not control for such things as differences in educational attainment between the immigrants and natives. Also, he only looks at median incomes. In the first part of this paper I use three different measures of labor market achievement (annual earnings, employment probabilities, and log earnings per week) to see if the

simple descriptive statistics show the sorts of disparities Sowell reports, and then to see if the disparities persist once I control for other explanatory variables. When discussing discrimination, analysts are typically most interested in differences between minority groups and the majority white population. Therefore, in the multivariate analysis, I also include white males and control for race, to see how far, if at all, the immigrant blacks move toward closing the black/white differential.

Even if Sowell is correct in claiming that immigrant blacks outperform native blacks, the differences between native and immigrant blacks may be due to the selection process associated with migration, and not the different cultures in which each group was reared. To address this question I split the native blacks into "non-movers" and "movers," where movers are those who reside in a state other than the one in which they were born. This comparison helps distinguish between cultural effects and migration effects.

Observed differences in labor market returns may arise for various reasons. One group may have better endowments, or higher returns to these endowments. I calculate three sets of Oaxaca decompositions to breakdown these differences, using native born black "non-movers," all native born blacks, and native born whites as the baseline comparison groups. I then discuss the reasons for some of the differences in returns to the endowments.

In this part of the paper, I find that immigrant blacks are significantly different from their native-born counterparts. At low educational levels, the Jamaican and other Caribbean immigrants do outperform the native blacks. Most of their advantages are in employment probabilities, however, and they do not generally seem to receive much higher salaries. Although immigrant blacks, by some criteria, outperform native blacks, there are still large disparities

between their success and that of native whites, for which discrimination still a potential explanation. When native blacks who have migrated internally are included, they have patterns similar to immigrant blacks, indicating that the selection processes associated with migration are responsible for many of the differences between native and non-native blacks. The Oaxaca decompositions show that both the immigrant and migrant blacks have higher levels of endowments, but much lower returns to most of these endowments.

A second aspect of this paper is a discussion of the assimilation rates of black immigrants, or the changes in the quality of successive immigrant cohorts. Chiswick (1978), using white males, claims to establish a rate of assimilation which leads white male immigrants to equal and surpass their native counterparts after 15 years in the U.S. I present results for both whites and blacks to see if black immigrants have similar assimilation patterns. I also discuss Borjas' (1985) claim that these cross-sectional patterns do not indicate assimilation, but rather a decline in the quality of successive immigrant cohorts after the 1965 Immigration Act caused a shift in the sending regions, allowing in many more people from less developed countries. By focusing on a specific group, Jamaicans, I examine whether there exists evidence of a decline in immigrant quality not associated with a shift in the sending countries.

In this section, I find that the "assimilation" rates of black immigrants do not look similar to those of white immigrants. There is some evidence that the quality of immigrant blacks has declined, but the decline is not necessarily coincident with the change in the laws, nor necessarily due to a shift in the sending countries.

The paper proceeds with a discussion of the data and descriptive statistics in section II. Section III presents multivariate analyses, including the Oaxaca

decompositions. Section IV is the discussion of assimilation rates versus changes in cohort quality. Section V is a summary and brief conclusion.

II. Data and Descriptive Statistics

The data used here are from the five percent and one percent Public Use Samples of the 1980 U.S. Census for blacks and whites, respectively. The sample of blacks consists of 203,956 men between the ages of eighteen and sixty-two. The sample of whites consists of 168,084 men between the ages of 18 and sixty-two.¹ As I am interested in the labor market achievements of these men, I chose only prime age males. There are 8,569 (4.03% of the blacks) black immigrants and 15,284 white immigrants in the sample. I omitted those people who were born abroad of American parents and those born in U.S. outlying areas.

The black immigrant categories were chosen based on the number of immigrants who originated in that country.² The categories are Jamaicans, "other" Caribbeans, Africans, and other black immigrants. Although lumping "other" Caribbeans together and all Africans together may not be ideal, there are not enough immigrants from the individual countries to allow a separate category for each. Jamaica, which sends by far the largest number of black immigrants to the U.S., will be discussed in the most detail. As this paper is primarily concerned with black immigrants, I do not separately identify the white immigrants by their home countries.

Native-born blacks are divided into two categories. "Movers" are defined to be those who now live in a state other than the one in which they were born.

¹For the whites I took a one in three sample of the native-born. The weights are adjusted to reflect this.

²Jamaican, "other" Caribbean, and African immigrants are all defined to be black.

"Non-Movers" are native blacks who continued to reside in their state of birth.

The second column of Table I reports actual mean of annual wage or salary earnings. The mean annual earnings of black immigrants is slightly below that of U.S. native blacks. Consistent with Sowell's report, West Indians, including Jamaicans and some "other" Caribbeans, have higher average annual earnings than the non-immigrants. African immigrants have the lowest earnings of any group. These numbers lend prima facie support to Sowell's claims, until one looks at the mean annual earnings for the native black movers. This group has mean annual earnings above all the black immigrant categories.

The groups with the highest annual earnings, among the blacks, also have higher levels of other characteristics generally linked to greater labor market success: they have higher educational attainment, are older, more likely to be married, more likely to have been employed in the previous year, and worked more weeks in the previous year than the native-born blacks.

The striking exception to this pattern is the educational level of the African immigrants. On average, they have completed 15.7 years of schooling, or the equivalent of 3.7 years of college. The last four columns of table I present the distribution of educational attainment for all the different groups. A higher percentage of the Africans are college graduates and have attended some graduate school (53.3%) than of any other group, including the white natives and white immigrants. As noted, the African immigrants have the lowest earnings; they also have the lowest probability of having been employed in the previous year and report the least number of weeks worked. It is quite likely that many of the African immigrants are here to attend graduate school. This is consistent with their high levels of education and their relative youth. When they do work, it is probably only part time. This would explain their low annual wages and

salaries and their low employment probabilities.

Table II presents means of the same variables as the preceding table for those who reported some employment in 1979. This presents a somewhat different picture. The gap between the annual earnings of the U.S. native blacks and the Jamaicans falls from \$1,052 overall to \$213, well within the bounds of sampling error, when one looks at only those who were employed. Although the mean annual earnings of Jamaicans and natives no longer appear statistically different, Jamaicans still have "better" characteristics in terms of the fraction married, age and education. The "other" Caribbean group no longer appears to earn more than the native U.S. blacks; again they are statistically indistinguishable. The difference between the Africans and the native U. S. blacks, always the largest, has narrowed from \$2,454 to \$1,574. The only gap which has not narrowed is between the native black "movers" and "non-movers." The annual earnings of both these groups of native blacks are higher, but the difference is about the same (around \$2,800 in both the full sample and the sample of those who were employed). This suggests that differences in employment account for most of the differences between immigrants and non-immigrants blacks.

These summary statistics are intriguing: they show that some black immigrants, particularly those from Jamaica (West Indians in general were Thomas Sowell's specific group of interest) have higher annual earnings than the native population. They also have higher educational levels, and higher employment-population ratios. The data also show that the group of native black migrants have even better characteristics than the immigrant blacks. In the next section, I present regression results to see if these differences in earnings persist after controlling for many of the observable individual characteristics.

III. Multivariate Analysis

A. A Comparison of Native and Immigrant Blacks

In this section I use ordinary least squares regressions to try to distinguish between potential explanations for the wage and salary differences between native blacks and various black immigrant groups. The simple means presented in the previous section indicate that one of the major differences between immigrants and non-immigrants is the percentage who were employed in the previous year. For this reason, I present one set of results that explain annual earnings, for the entire population (including those with zero earnings). A second set of results pertain to the probability of employment. I present linear probability models for employment in 1979, using the same explanatory variables as for earnings. These results provide some evidence as to whether differences in employment propensities persist once control variables are included.

The final set of regressions restricts both wages and weeks worked to be strictly greater than zero. An approximate weekly wage is constructed by dividing wages by weeks. Taking the logarithm yields a logarithmic weekly earnings function. This specification allows me to determine if immigrants are paid a higher wage than natives, rather than just employed for more weeks in the year.

The aforementioned dependent variables are all regressed on the same group of explanatory variables. These covariates include the highest grade completed, experience and experience squared. These are the basic building blocks for the canonical human capital model.³ It is a well established empirical finding that

³Experience was constructed by taking age minus schooling minus six, since men are assumed to begin work directly after they finish schooling. One should keep in mind that immigrant and native men of the same age will most likely have

married men have higher earnings than their unmarried counterparts (Korenman and Neumark, 1988). Therefore, a dummy variable is included which is equal to one if an individual is currently married, and is zero otherwise. One important difference between immigrants and non-immigrants may be proficiency in the English language. A "poor English ability" variable is included, which is equal to one if the person reported speaking English poorly or not at all, to control for this.⁴ Sowell and Borjas (1989) both note that one of the many dimensions in which immigrants differ from natives is in the areas where they live.⁵ Some of the earnings differences between native blacks and immigrant blacks may be due to labor market conditions in the areas in which they choose to live. A dummy for "South" is included to control for the geographical wage differences.⁶ As the reader will see, these geographic effects are significant. Living in the South has a negative effect on earnings and a positive effect on probability of employment.

Dummy variables are used to account for each of the immigrant categories. These dummies indicating immigrant origins are interacted with the highest grade

a different number of years of U.S. experience.

⁴As reported in table VI, difficulty with English varies across immigrant groups with "other" Caribbeans, "other" black immigrants, and white immigrants reporting the highest fraction with poor English.

⁵Forty-six percent of the black immigrants in my sample live in New York state, as opposed to only 7.3 percent of the black natives. Other states with relatively high fractions of black immigrants are Florida, California, and New Jersey, with 8.5%, 6.0%, and 4.8%, respectively. Many native blacks live in the relatively low-wage Southern states.

⁶In other regressions, a complete set of state dummies is used to sweep out state fixed effects (available on request). The state dummies are collectively significant; however, controlling for regional variation in the labor market does not cancel out the immigrant effect and has virtually no effect on the size of the coefficients. The differences between immigrants and non-immigrants are much deeper than simply area of residence.

completed to allow for differing effects of, or rates of return to, education across different countries of origin.

Table III presents regression results for annual earnings, employment probabilities and log earnings per week for the sample of blacks. The results of the annual earnings regressions⁷ in column one indicate that immigrants taken as a whole earn about \$1,731 less than natives (the derivative with respect to the immigrant dummy, evaluated at the mean educational level for immigrants). Similarly, the second column shows that the probability of employment is 2% lower for immigrants taken as a whole. Finally, column three indicates that immigrants' log earnings per week are 15.3% less than natives'.⁸

In all three cases, of annual earnings, employment probabilities, and log earnings per week, a similar pattern emerges. The immigrant dummy is positive, and the interaction term of immigrant with highest grade completed is negative. This indicates that at low levels of education, immigrants have greater labor market success than the native blacks. Immigrants have much lower returns to education. At some level of education, natives begin to do better by these three measures of labor market performance.

These patterns remain when immigrants groups are broken into more specific categories. The last three columns of table III present regressions with

⁷ Specification tests reveal that the errors are heteroskedastic. Earlier versions included regressions with asymptotically correct standard errors. As this has very little effect and is very expensive, I only use the white correction method for the linear probability models.

⁸F-statistics for the exclusion of all immigrant and immigrant interaction terms are reported at the bottom of the tables. An F-test rejects the pooled sample at all conventional levels of significance. However, the full set of interactions does not perceptibly change the intercept, nor the coefficient on education. The large calculated F-statistics are to be expected given the sample sizes. Thus, the relatively more stringent Schwartz criterion is reported in the last line of the table. In table III, all specifications pass the Schwartz criterion as well as the F-test.

area or country of origin variables included. One can see that the labor market performance varies not only between immigrants and non-immigrants, but across immigrant groups as well. Taking the derivative with respect to each of the origin dummy variables and evaluating at the mean of the level of education for each group gives the overall effect of origin on these measures of labor market performance. At the mean educational level, Jamaicans, Caribbeans, Africans and "other" black immigrants are all worse off than the native black population in terms of annual earnings and log earnings per week.

The linear probability model for employment paints a different picture (column 5). Although Jamaicans and other Caribbeans have lower overall earnings, at the mean levels of education, they are more likely to be employed than the non-immigrant blacks. Jamaicans are employed 6.3% more often, while the other Caribbeans are employed 2.0% more often. The Africans and the other immigrants are both less likely to be employed than the native blacks.

The Jamaicans and the other Caribbean immigrants consistently do better than the native blacks at low levels of education. However, they have much lower returns to education than the natives. At some level of education, the natives catch up to and exceed the immigrants in terms of all three dependent variables. For instance one can see from Table III that at 9.4 years of education, the natives begin to have higher annual earnings than the Jamaicans. In terms of employment probabilities, Jamaicans are more likely to be employed than the native population until an educational level of 14.8 years, which is above the mean levels of education for both the natives and the Jamaicans. Lastly, the breakeven level of education in terms of log earnings per week is 6.3 years of

education for the Jamaicans.⁹

Given these results, Sowell's claims no longer seem valid. Once control variables have been added, the black immigrants from the West Indies no longer appear to be earning more than the native black population, except, perhaps those at very low levels of education. Thus, although the immigrants have better labor market characteristics, they do not have higher paying jobs, although they do appear significantly more likely to be employed.

B. A Comparison of Native Whites, Native Blacks, and Immigrants.

A stronger test of Sowell's claims is to see how immigrant blacks compare to the native white population. As we have seen, it is only in terms of employment probabilities that the immigrant blacks seem to be significantly outperforming the native blacks. It is important to investigate to what extent, if any do immigrant blacks close the gap between blacks and whites.

Table IV presents regressions in the same basic framework as before. Now, the comparison group is native white men. A black dummy is included which is equal to one for all black individuals, regardless of immigrant status. Another dummy is used to indicate native blacks who reside in a state other than where they were born. A dummy variable for white immigrants is also included.

In this framework, again, Jamaicans are the best of the black immigrants. However, it is only in terms of the employment probabilities that the Jamaican immigrants move toward closing the gap between blacks and whites.

Notice that by some criteria the native black "movers" perform better than

⁹One should be a bit careful about making inferences from parts of the regression line where there are relatively few people. The notion of a crossover point is most meaningful in the employment probability regressions, as in the others the crossover point is at extremely low levels of education. As table I indicates, a very small portion of the sample has such low levels of education.

the Jamaicans. In terms of annual earnings and log earnings per week, the gap between the native black movers and the native white population is the smallest. In terms of employment probabilities, Jamaicans are 13% less likely to be employed than the white natives, while black migrants are 18% less likely to be employed. This table shows that native blacks who have moved are as different from the native non-migrant black population as those who have immigrated from abroad.

In fact, the immigrants and the native movers show similar patterns. For instance, in the log earnings per week regression in the last column of table IV, one can see that the rate of return to education for these two groups is virtually identical (although the Jamaican education coefficient is not significant) and lower than the non-moving black population. In both cases, the intercept for these two groups is higher than for the native black non-movers.

C. Oaxaca Decompositions.

From the previous section it is clear that migrants and non-migrants differ not only in their endowment, but also in their returns to these endowments. In this section I investigate what portion of these differences can be attributed to differences in the coefficients versus differences in characteristics (Oaxaca, 1973). To do this I split the samples and ran separate regressions for each of the groups of interest. Table V uses native born black non-movers as the baseline for comparison (Blinder, 1973).¹⁰ A negative number means that the

¹⁰ More specifically,

$$E = \sum_i \beta_i^B (X_i^B - X_i^C)$$

where E = the earnings differential predicted on the basis of differing endowments,

$$C = \sum_i X_i^C (\beta_i^B - \beta_i^C)$$

group in question is better off than the baseline group. The regressions for the Oaxaca decompositions include highest grade completed, experience, experience squared, dummy variables for poor english ability, married and southern residence, and a constant term. The decompositions themselves assume the individuals are married, do not have poor english ability, and do not live in the south, as this is true for most of the sample.

Focusing on the log earnings per week, one can see that in terms of the endowments all of the groups are better off than the native black non-movers. Overall, the difference in log earnings per week between the native black movers and the native black non-movers is a slight 0.5%, with the movers earning more.¹¹ The native black movers would have about 9% percent lower earnings per week if they had the same endowments as the non-moving population. Jamaicans have 4.0% higher overall earnings per week than the non-moving blacks. If the Jamaicans had the same endowments as the non-movers, they would have 8% lower earnings.

It is in the returns to these endowments where the non-moving native population does better than the other groups. In the log earnings per week regressions, for both the migrant black natives and the Jamaican immigrants the coefficients on education and marriage are lower than for the comparison group. In fact, married Jamaicans earn only 14.1% more relative to the unmarried,

where C = the earnings differential predicted on the basis of differing coefficients, and

$$U = \beta_0^B - \beta_0^C$$

where U = unexplained earnings differential, predicted on the basis of the constant.

¹¹The first column is the overall difference; the sum of the other components.

compared to 22.6% for the native black movers, and 24.5% for the native black non-movers, respectively. The coefficients on experience and experience squared are larger in absolute value for the Jamaicans and the native movers. The differences in the coefficients evaluated at the mean of the Jamaican endowments favors the non-moving natives, and indicates that Jamaicans would have 19% higher earnings per week if they had the same returns to their endowments as the non-moving natives. The unexplained difference (the difference in the constants) favors the Jamaicans.

As before, the native blacks who have moved show a pattern quite similar to the Jamaicans. In terms of weekly earnings, they have lower returns to their endowments, and a larger constant term. On the basis of the coefficients (other than the constant term) the native black movers would have 17% higher weekly earnings, if they got the same returns to their endowments as the native non-movers.

I calculated two further sets of Oaxaca decompositions.¹² In one case I use all native U.S. blacks as the baseline for comparison. I find that without separating out the native black migrants, the picture changes, with Jamaicans no longer having higher overall log earnings per week. This underscores the importance of treating those who are migrants, whether from abroad, or from elsewhere in the U.S., as different from those who have not migrated. In the second case, I use native U.S. whites as the baseline group. In this case I find that in terms of annual earnings and employment probabilities, the Jamaicans and the native black migrants come closer to closing the gap between blacks and whites than do the non-migrant blacks. In terms of log earnings per week, the Jamaicans, overall are closest to the native white population. Once again, I find

¹²Available on request.

(in terms of the weekly earnings) that it is in the returns to their endowments where the native migrants and the immigrant blacks do poorly; both in comparison to the native whites and the native non-migrant black population.

D. Differences in Returns to Endowments.

As the Oaxaca decompositions indicate, immigrants from Jamaica and elsewhere in the Caribbean and the internal black migrants in the U.S. have much different returns to their endowments. They have lower returns to education and marriage and larger (in absolute value) returns to experience and experience squared. In the next sections I will consider possible explanations for this.

i) Returns to Education

It is common to find that immigrants have lower returns to education. In his study of adult white men, using log annual earnings as the dependent variable, Chiswick (1978) reports that immigrants have a higher intercept than natives, but lower returns to education, resulting in natives earning more than immigrants after 16.8 years of education. The rate of return to education for the native men was 7.2% and 5.5% for immigrants. In table IV, with log earnings per week as the dependent variable, I find that native black non-movers have a rate of return to education of 8.3%, while Jamaican immigrants have a rate of return to education of only 6.4%.

Various explanations for this finding are possible. Greeley (1976) suggested that discrimination against immigrants may increase with the level of schooling. In other words, there is more discrimination against immigrants in the types of high paying jobs one needs higher levels of education in order to enter. One idea seems to be that in jobs which require higher levels of education, the

individual has to interact with other people more, language ability may be more important etc. In white collar jobs, employers may be more averse to hiring foreigners. However, this explanation seems far less cogent for blacks than for whites since the cross-over point occurs at quite low levels of education. Also, I control for language ability, so that should not be what is driving the result.

Another reason employers who hire highly educated people may be unlikely to hire immigrants is that they simply do not know what their education means. Firms that specialize in hiring less-skilled workers may be indifferent as to the level of education of their workforce and the quality of that education. Highly educated people from foreign countries may be the victims not of explicit xenophobia, but of a lack of information.

Even if lack of information regarding the educational quality is not a problem, it is still possible that the actual quality of education is lower in many foreign countries. Ten years of education in Jamaica may mean something quite different from ten years of education in the U.S. Indeed, the education need not be worse in the origin countries to produce these education profiles, it need only be different. It may be that the U.S. educational system is relatively worse at providing the skills needed in the jobs filled by those with few years of academic training.

Let us focus on Jamaica as this is the only country which is separately identified. In the years between 1960 and 1986 the illiteracy rate in the adult population has remained constant at about 15%¹³. The percent of blacks who are illiterate in the U.S. was 1.6 in 1979 (O'Neill and Sepielli). The student teacher ratio for primary and secondary schools in Jamaica was 32.4 in 1978. In

¹³ From The Economist-Country Profile, 1986-1987, and The Statistical Yearbook of Jamaica, 1974.

the U.S. this ratio was only 19.3. These figures would lend credence to the idea that the Jamaican educational system is not as good as that in the U.S.

Other explanations pertain to sample selection biases. Chiswick (1978) and others have suggested that immigrants are positively selected from the population in their countries of origin in terms of ability and motivation. Chiswick hypothesized that the poorly educated may be even more positively selected than their better educated compatriots. Thus, at low levels of education, the poorly educated immigrants have higher annual earnings, higher employment probabilities, and higher log annual earnings than might be expected.

Another explanation is that the selection process associated with migration annuls some of the ability bias associated with the coefficient on education. Ability bias in the return to education coefficient has been intensely studied (see, for example, Griliches 1977). The notion is that while education may benefit people, the high rates of return to education that are typically found using traditional domestic data sources are due to the fact that highly able people also tend to become highly educated. Without controlling for ability, one cannot conclude that the rate of return to education is not simply a return to ability. If immigrants are positively selected, then the distribution of abilities among them would be much less dispersed than among the native population as a whole. Thus, while ability bias may still be a problem, it should be less of a problem among the immigrants. The coefficient on education for the immigrant groups may be closer to the true return to education.

The rate of return to education for the native black internal migrants (6.3%) lends support to this notion. It is virtually identical to the rate of return to education for Jamaicans (6.4%). Like migrants from outside the U.S., migrants within the U.S. will not be a randomly selected subset of U.S. natives.

One might argue that there may be differences in educational quality between places people migrate from and where they end up, or that employers in one region of the country have less information about what a particular level of education means for someone reared elsewhere, but these problems should be less severe than for foreign immigrants.

ii) Returns to Marriage

Similarly, the coefficient on the marriage dummy may be higher for the non-movers because of selection bias among the migrants. Suppose marriage is correlated with some unobserved ability which is valuable in the work place. Again, suppose that the distribution of these abilities is less dispersed among migrants than among people who had never moved. Then, the coefficient on the marriage dummy would be higher for the non-movers than for the U.S. migrants and the immigrants from abroad.

Korenman and Neumark (May 1988) investigate the possibility that marriage is just a proxy for quality as opposed to actually changing a person's productivity. They find that most of their evidence points to marriage actually making men more productive. However, they also find that this effect tends to increase with length of marriage. Guinnane (Ph.D dissertation, 1987) finds that some groups of immigrants (the Irish) marry much later than natives. Future research might investigate whether this is true for some black immigrants as well.

iii) Returns to Experience

The Jamaican immigrants have a steeper earnings/experience profile, which drops off more quickly, than the native blacks. The native black movers,

similarly, have a steeper profile than the native black non-movers. This may be due to an assimilation process. When immigrants first arrive in a new area there may be a period of adjustment during which productivity rises quickly. Once the assimilation is "complete," the profile would then drop off. The question of whether an assimilation effect is evident in cross-sectional analyses has been the subject of recent controversy (see, for example, Borjas, 1985) and will be discussed in detail in the next section.

IV. Assimilation Rates and Cohort Quality

The Census only reports the year of immigration information in intervals. Immigrants are categorized as having arrived less than five years ago, between five and ten years ago, between fifteen and ten years ago, between twenty and fifteen years ago, between thirty and twenty years ago, or over thirty years ago. Table VI shows the percent of immigrants in each group who arrived in each of the year intervals. Clearly, the black immigrants arrived much more recently than the white immigrants. This reflects the 1965 Immigration Act. Prior to this change in the law, the number of visas allocated to a particular country was based on the number of people of that origin who were already residing in the U.S.; visas were then given to the people of a particular country based on skills. After 1965, a 20,000 visa limit was established for all countries, and preferences were given to people with family members in the U.S.

Using the six year of immigration categories, Chiswick (1978) estimated a regression comparing foreign-born adult white men with the native population and found that immigrants initially earn less, but their earnings rise more rapidly with U.S. labor market experience. His results indicate that immigrants should have earnings equal to and surpassing those of the native population ten to

fifteen years after their arrival. Chiswick attributed this finding to an assimilation effect. If this is correct, and there is an assimilation effect, then one could say that an immigrant will earn more later, based on the fact that immigrants who entered earlier now earn more. One can then calculate an overtaking or breakeven point for the immigrants and discuss the different assimilation rates across different sending regions.

Table VII compares black immigrants to all black natives (ignoring the difference between native migrants and non-migrants) and Table VIII compares white immigrants to all white natives. A dummy variable has been added for each of the categories of years since immigration. In table VII, these dummy variables have been interacted with the dummies for region of origin to allow for different assimilation rates for people of different origins. Except in the case of the employment probabilities, these interacted terms are not significant, indicating that the different black immigrants groups have fairly similar assimilation rates.¹⁴

Taking the black immigrants as a whole, one can see that at twenty years after immigration, they have higher annual earnings than their native black counterparts.¹⁵ Log earnings per week also show an overtaking after twenty years in the U.S. For employment probabilities, the crossover point occurs at ten years since immigration, although the over thirty year category is again negative.

Does this seem to parallel the immigrant white's relationship to their native counterparts? Table VIII shows similar regressions for immigrant whites.

¹⁴It is also true that within each of the year of immigration categories the sample sizes get rather small. This may account for the lack of significance of the origin specific year of immigration coefficients.

¹⁵Evaluated at the mean of the educational level for black immigrants.

In the last three columns, controlling for immigrant education, we can see that the crossover point occurs at fifteen years since immigration in all three regressions. This is exactly what Chiswick found using the 1970 census. The white immigrants appear to have a more concrete "crossover" point than do the black immigrants.

For assimilation to be the correct interpretation of the years-since-arrival variables, one has to think the newly arrived immigrants have the same characteristics as those who arrived earlier. Borjas (1985, 1986, 1987) claims that Chiswick's results are mainly an artifact of cross-sectional estimation. He says that the immigrants are not the same, in fact they are worse. According to Borjas, after the 1965 Immigration act, there was a precipitous decline in the quality of immigrants to the U.S.

Borjas presents some evidence indicating that the quality of U.S. immigrants has changed. Before the 1965 law was passed, immigrants to the U.S. came from Northern and Western Europe. These are places where the income distribution, in general, is less disperse than the U.S. Thus, those people who saw themselves as being at the top of the distribution of skill, would feel they had a great deal to gain from migrating to the U.S. Namely, they would still be in the top of the income distribution, but that would translate to a much higher income in the new, less egalitarian, world.

Under the changes in the immigration laws, more people are now eligible to come from non-European countries, e.g. countries in Africa and Latin America. These countries are generally characterized as having more skewed income distributions than the U.S., with lower means. Thus, the people who would be attracted to the U.S. from these countries would be people who feel their skills would land them in the lower end of the distribution. In other words, the best

and the brightest in these countries would be satisfied to stay home, while the unskilled would choose to migrate to the U.S. Thus, the regression results in tables VII and VIII can be said to show that some of the immigrants who arrived earlier do better because they are better, not because they have had more time to assimilate into the American way of life.

It is interesting, however, that for the white immigrants, fifteen years after immigration has turned out to be a key juncture in this, as well as in Chiswick's work. Here, the group that has been in the U.S. for fifteen years immigrated between 1965 and 1970, after the change in the immigration law, when the decline in quality was supposed to have begun. Of course, there could have been a lag between the time the law took effect and when the poorer quality immigrants began to arrive.

The criticism of the cross-sectional approach seems quite cogent when looking at the results in table VII. It seems unlikely that black immigrants would be worse off than the native-born blacks up until twenty years after immigration, suddenly be better off, and then at thirty years after immigration be worse off again. It is more probable that these groups are simply different from one another. The "crossover" point occurs at about twenty years since immigration which means that this group that migrated between 1960 and 1965, just prior to the change in the immigration laws. Interpreting these coefficients as an assimilation rates seems inappropriate, but nor does it seem appropriate to interpret them as a rate of decline of the immigrant cohorts. It may be that, for the black immigrants, something was different about the 1960-1965 cohort.

Table VI investigates whether there is any observable decline in the quality of black immigrants coming to the U.S. at the time of the Immigration Act. Educational attainment by cohort is presented for all the different black

immigrant groups. I also construct a U.S. comparison group for blacks by first calculating the approximate age at immigration for the black immigrants, and then finding the mean educational levels of the black U.S. natives who fall within the same rough age group. For some groups of black immigrants, namely the Jamaicans and the other Caribbeans, there has been a decline in educational attainment over time; while the black native comparison group has steadily increased in educational levels. However, in the case of the Jamaicans at least, the decline seems to have begun before the change in the immigration laws.

V. Conclusion

This paper begins with Sowell's arguments and considers whether, as he suggests, the labor market outcomes of black immigrants give any insight into the labor market outcomes of native-born black men. I find that it is the poorly educated immigrants who appear to be better off than their U.S.-born counterparts and that the immigrant blacks have different returns to most of the characteristics included in a standard human capital regression. It is really only in terms of employment probabilities that the immigrant blacks generally meet with greater success than the natives. When a group of U.S.-born blacks who have migrated from their state of birth is considered, they look more similar to the immigrants than to the native black non-movers. This comparison serves to controvert Sowell's arguments. The native-born movers are generally quite successful, even though they are arguably as exposed to the "cultural traditions of the American Negro (Essays and Data) ." This, coupled with the fact that the white immigrants do very well compared to the native whites, implies that it is the selection process involved in migration decisions which accounts for whatever successes the black immigrants enjoy over their native counterparts, and not

these said cultural traditions.

Finally, I compare black and white immigrants and discuss the assimilation rate/cohort quality controversy. I find the same "crossover" point for white immigrants, fifteen years after immigration, that Chiswick found using the 1970 Census. I find much weaker indication of a crossover point for the black immigrants. The group which immigrated twenty years prior to the Census seems to meet with the greatest labor market success, but both the earlier and the later arrivals fare less well. There has been some decline in the quality of the black immigrants coming to the U.S., at least insofar as educational attainment is concerned. As I find this decline for specific countries of origin, it does not appear that it is due, as Borjas suggests, to a shift in the sending countries from those with egalitarian income distributions to those with more skewed income distributions. It is more likely that the decline is due to the changes in the procedure for granting visas from one that is skill based to one that gives preference to those with family members in the U.S. Nevertheless, the timing of the declines in educational quality for some groups of black immigrants does not coincide with the changes in the law. Clearly, more information is necessary to determine if there has been, and if so why, a decline in the quality of immigrants to the U.S.

Immigrant blacks have mostly been ignored, both in discussions about blacks in the U.S. and in discussions about immigrants. This paper shows that black immigrants are significantly different from the majority of the native black population, and from other immigrant groups. This paper takes steps toward remedying this neglect.

REFERENCES

- Blinder, Alan, "Wage Discrimination: Reduced Form and Structural Estimates," Journal of Human Resources, 1973.
- Borjas, George J., "Assimilation, Changes in Cohort Quality, and the Earnings of Immigrants," Journal of Labor Economics, 1985.
- Borjas, George J., "Immigration and the Family," mimeo, 1989.
- Borjas, George J., "The Self-Employment Experience of Immigrants," NBER Working Paper Series, Working Paper No. 1942, 1986.
- Borjas, George J., "Self-Selection and the Earnings of Immigrants," The American Economic Review, 1987.
- Chiswick, Barry R., "The Effects of Americanization on the Earnings of Foreign Born Men," Journal of Political Economy, 1978.
- Greeley, Andrew, Ethnicity, Denomination and Inequality, Beverly Hills, California: Sage, 1976.
- Griliches, Zvi, "Estimating Returns to Schooling: Some Econometric Problems," Econometrica, 1977.
- Guinnane, Timothy, Migration, Marriage, and Household Formation: The Irish at the Turn of the Century, Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1987.
- Heckman, James J., "An Investigation of the Labor Market Earnings of Panamanian Males: Evaluating Sources of Inequality," Journal of Human Resources, 1986.
- Korenman, Sanders D. and David Neumark, "Does Marriage Really Make Men More Productive?," Finance and Economics Discussion Series, May 1988.
- Mincer, J., Schooling, Experience, and Earnings, Columbia University Press, 1974.
- Oaxaca, R., "Male-Female Wage Differences in Urban Labor Markets," International Economic Review, 1973.
- O'Neill, Dave M. and Peter Sepielli, "Education in the United States: 1940-1983," Special Demographic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1985.
- Psacharopoulos, G., "Returns to Education: An Updated International Comparison," Comparative Education, vol. 17, #3, 1981.
- Sowell, Thomas, "Three Black Histories," Essays and Data on American Ethnic Groups, c. 1978, The Urban Institute, pp.41-48.
- Warren, Robert, and Peck, Jeniffer Marks, "Foreign-born Emigration from the United States: 1960 to 1970," Demography 17, no. 1 (February 1980): 71-84.

Table I
Summary Statistics

(standard errors in parentheses)

ORIGIN	SAMPLE SIZE	ANNUAL EARNINGS	FRACTION EMPLOYED LAST YR.	WEEKS WORKED '79	AGE	EXPERIENCE	FRACTION MARRIED	MEAN EDUC.	Distribution of Education: (percents)			
									0-8	9-11	12-15	16+
All Blacks	203956	9058 (19.3)	0.79 (0.0009)	34.5 (.05)	35 (.03)	17.6 (0.03)	0.51 (.001)	11.5 (0.007)				
All Native U.S. Blacks	195387	9063 (19.7)	0.79 (.001)	34.6 (.05)	35.2 (.03)	17.7 (.01)	0.51 (.001)	11.5 (0.01)	15.3	21.9	53.0	9.6
Native Black "Movers"	81002	10710 (33.3)	0.82 (0.001)	36.6 (0.07)	37.7 (0.04)	20.0 (0.05)	0.57 (0.002)	11.7 (0.01)	14.4	20.5	53.2	11.8
Native Black "Non-Movers"	114385	7896 (23.3)	0.77 (0.001)	33.1 (0.06)	33.4 (0.03)	16.1 (0.04)	0.47 (0.001)	11.3 (0.009)	16.0	23.2	52.9	8.1
All Black Immigrants	8569	8929 (95.8)	0.80 (.004)	34.5 (.2)	34.5 (.12)	15.8 (0.13)	0.58 (.005)	12.7 (0.04)				
JAMAICA	1860	10115 (197)	0.87 (.008)	38.0 (.46)	36.2 (.27)	18.4 (0.30)	0.62 (.01)	11.8 (0.08)	17.3	13.0	55.2	14.4
Other CARRIBEAN	3299	9525 (151)	0.84 (.006)	37.1 (.35)	35.7 0.19	17.5 (0.21)	0.62 (.008)	12.1 (0.07)	15.2	14.0	53.5	17.4
AFRICA	1418	6609 (251)	0.66 (.013)	25.8 (.60)	30.2 (.18)	8.5 (0.19)	0.51 (.013)	15.7 (0.07)	1.2	1.5	43.1	53.3
Other Black Immigrants	1992	8485 (196)	0.77 (.009)	33.1 (.49)	34.1 (.08)	15.9 (0.27)	0.53 (.01)	12.1 (0.08)	13.8	14.8	56.4	15.2
Native U.S. Whites	152804	14371 (31.7)	0.93 (0.0006)	43.4 (0.04)	36.7 (0.03)	17.9 (0.03)	0.68 (0.001)	12.9 (0.008)	7.9	12.4	56.7	22.9
White Immigrants	15284	15421 (116)	0.90 (0.002)	41.8 (0.14)	39.5 (0.09)	20.8 (0.11)	0.71 (0.004)	12.8 (0.03)	16.3	9.9	46.2	27.6

Note: The samples consist of black males aged 18-62 in the 5 percent Public Use Sample of the 1980 Census and white males aged 18-62 in the 1 percent Public Use Sample of the 1980 Census.
Individuals born abroad to American parents or born in U.S. outlying areas are excluded.
"Education" in the Census includes two years before first grade; these two years have been subtracted in this paper so that 12 years of education is highschool etc.

Table II
Summary Statistics
for those who were
Employed in the Previous Year

(standard errors in parentheses)

ORIGIN	SAMPLE SIZE	ANNUAL EARNINGS	WEEKS WORKED '79	AGE	EDUCATION	EXPERIENCE	FRACTION MARRIED
All Native U.S. Blacks	154145	11454 (21.1)	43.8 (0.04)	35.0 (0.03)	11.8 (0.008)	17.1 (0.03)	0.57 (.001)
Native Black "Movers"	66037	13098 (34.5)	44.9 (0.1)	37.07 (0.05)	12.10 (0.01)	19.0 (0.05)	0.61 (0.002)
Native Black "Non-Movers"	88108	10221 (25.4)	43.0 (0.1)	33.4 (0.04)	11.6 (0.01)	15.8 (0.04)	0.54 (0.001)
Black Immigrants	6848	11131 (104)	43.1 (0.2)	35.4 (0.13)	12.7 (0.05)	16.7 (0.14)	0.64 (0.006)
Jamaican	1610	11667 (201)	43.9 (0.34)	36.8 (0.28)	11.9 (0.09)	18.9 (0.31)	0.65 (0.01)
Other Carribean	2765	11347 (159)	44.2 (0.25)	36.4 (0.20)	12.3 (0.07)	18.1 (0.22)	0.66 (0.009)
African	933	9880 (331)	39.2 (0.51)	31.7 (0.22)	15.9 (0.09)	9.7 (0.23)	0.61 (0.016)
Other Black Immigrants	1540	10941 (216)	42.9 (0.37)	34.5 (0.28)	12.4 (0.09)	16.0 (0.30)	0.60 (0.013)
Native U.S. Whites	142653	15375 (32.3)	46.5 (0.03)	36.4 (0.03)	13.0 (0.008)	17.9 (0.03)	0.69 (0.001)
White Immigrants	13756	17095.0 (120.1)	46.4 (0.9)	39.80 (0.10)	12.8 (0.04)	21.0 (0.11)	0.74 (0.004)

Note: The samples consist of black males aged 18-62 in the 5 percent Public Use Sample of the 1980 Census and white males aged 18-62 in the 1 percent Public Use Sample of the 1980 Census.
Individuals born abroad to American parents of born in U.S. outlying areas are excluded.

Table III
Comparison of Black Immigrants with
Black Natives

(standard errors in parentheses)

	(1)			(2)		
	Dependent Annual Earnings	Variable: Whether* Employed	Log Earnings Per Week	Dependent Annual Earnings	Variable: Whether* Employed	Log Earnings Per Week
Mean of Dependent Var.	9058 (19.3)	0.79 (.0009)	5.32 (.002)			
Immigrant	2422 (299)	0.259 (.015)	0.165 (.034)			
Jamaican				1772 (604)	0.311 (.028)	0.088 (.066)
Other Caribbean				1765 (460)	0.226 (.024)	0.144 (.052)
African				-3789 (1208)	-0.080 (.073)	-0.258 (.145)
Other Immigrant				1246 (606)	0.077 (.034)	0.169 (.073)
Highest Grade	921 (6.3)	0.023 (.0003)	0.073 (.0007)	921 (6.3)	0.023 (.0003)	0.073 (.0007)
Highest Grade * Immigrant	-327 (23)	-0.022 (.001)	-.025 (.003)			
Highest Grade * Jamaican				-188 (49)	-0.021 (.002)	-0.014 (.005)
Highest Grade * Caribbean				-248 (36)	-0.017 (.002)	-0.024 (.004)
Highest Grade * African				-77 (76)	-0.010 (.005)	-0.005 (.009)
Highest Grade * Other Immig.				-214 (48)	-0.009 (.003)	-0.023 (.006)
Poor English Ability	-1206 (271)	-0.067 (.016)	-.157 (.031)	-1098 (274)	-0.062 (.015)	-0.151 (.032)
Married	4238 (36.7)	0.184 (.002)	.239 (.004)	4235 (37)	0.183 (.002)	0.240 (.004)
Experience	495 (4.7)	0.006 (.0003)	0.044 (.0005)	493 (10.3)	0.005 (.0003)	0.044 (.0006)
Exp. Squared	-8.1 (0.1)	-0.0002 (.000006)	-0.0006 (.00001)	-8.0 (.10)	-0.0002 (.000006)	-0.0006 (.00001)
South	-1329 (35.5)	0.034 (.002)	-0.192 (.004)	-1319 (35.5)	0.035 (.002)	-0.192 (.004)
Intercept	-7954 (91)	0.402 (0.005)	3.9 (.01)	-7937 (91)	0.403 (.005)	3.9 (.01)
R-Square	0.2553	0.1039	0.1731	0.2561	0.1053	0.1733
Sample Size:	203956	203956	158416	203956	203956	158416
F-test for exclusion of all immigrant and immigrant interaction variables.	313	200	170	104	89	48
Schwartz Criterion	12.23	12.23	11.97			

From 1980 Census 5 percent Public Use Sample

Sample includes black men between the ages of 18 and 62.

Regressions with log earnings per week include only those for whom

wages and weeks worked were strictly greater than zero.

* The standard errors have been corrected for arbitrary forms of heteroskedasticity.

Table IV
A Comparison of White Natives
with Native and Immigrant Blacks

(standard errors in parentheses)

	(1)			(2)		
	Dependent Annual Earnings	Variable: Whether* Employed	Log Earnings Per Week	Dependent Annual Earnings	Variable: Whether* Employed	Log Earnings Per Week
Mean of Dependent Var.	13981 (20.12)	0.98 (0.0002)	5.49 (0.002)			
Black	-2948 (87.4)	-0.224 (0.001)	-0.062 (0.008)	533.2 (315.8)	-0.518 (0.005)	-0.172 (0.030)
Native Black Movers	554.6 (131.5)	0.045 (0.002)	0.043 (0.011)	-35.5 (478.3)	0.012 (0.007)	0.280 (0.045)
Jamaicans	-414.2 (665.3)	0.094 (0.008)	-0.057 (0.055)	941.4 (2292.6)	0.365 (0.028)	0.167 (0.191)
Other Carribean	-1396.5 (503.5)	0.065 (0.006)	-0.143 (0.042)	978.2 (1712.7)	0.233 (0.024)	0.244 (0.149)
African	-5250.6 (760.7)	-0.121 (0.013)	-0.287 (0.072)	-3987.3 (4575.7)	-0.129 (0.076)	-0.128 (0.421)
Other Black Immigrants	-1283.4 (643.2)	0.001 (0.009)	-0.087 (0.056)	686.6 (2296.3)	0.080 (0.036)	0.265 (0.213)
White Immigrants	400.6 (107.2)	0.001 (0.0001)	0.015 (0.009)	3588.7 (360.5)	0.002 (0.0005)	0.320 (0.031)
Highest Grade	1129.4 (6.2)	0.002 (0.00003)	0.071 (0.0005)	1163.4 (6.5)	-0.0003 (0.00001)	0.073 (0.0006)
Highest Grade *Black				-303.8 (26.7)	0.026 (0.0004)	0.010 (0.002)
Highest Grade *Black Movers				60.5 (39.9)	0.002 (0.0006)	-0.020 (0.004)
Highest Grade * Jamaican				-101.6 (185.5)	-0.024 (0.002)	-0.019 (0.015)
Highest Grade *Other Carribean				-172.1 (135.1)	-0.015 (0.002)	-0.032 (0.012)
Highest Grade *African				-4.1 (288.0)	-0.006 (0.005)	-0.013 (0.026)

-continued-

Table IV continued
A Comparison of White Natives
with Native and Immigrant Blacks

(standard errors in parentheses)

	Annual Earnings	Whether* Employed	Log Earnings Per Week	Annual Earnings	Whether* Employed	Log Earnings Per Week
Highest Grade *Other Black Immig.				-141.0 (181.7)	-0.008 (0.003)	-0.029 (0.017)
Highest Grade *White Immigrant				-245.5 (26.5)	-0.00008 (0.00003)	-0.023 (0.002)
Poor English Ability	-876.8 (280.8)	0.0004 (0.001)	-0.097 (0.024)	-1504.7 (289.5)	-0.005 (0.001)	-0.163 (0.025)
Married	4318.5 (43.0)	0.018 (0.0002)	0.410 (0.004)	4318.6 (43.0)	0.017 (0.0002)	0.409 (0.004)
Experience	821.5 (5.3)	0.0004 (0.00003)	0.078 (0.0005)	823.0 (5.3)	0.0002 (0.00003)	0.079 (0.0005)
Experience Squared	-15.1 (0.120)	-0.00002 (0.00000)	-0.001 (0.00001)	-15.2 (0.120)	-0.00001 (0.00000)	-0.001 (0.00001)
South	-1135.1 (38.6)	0.004 (0.0002)	-0.096 (0.003)	-1127.6 (38.6)	0.004 (0.0002)	-0.094 (0.003)
Intercept	-10036.1 (95.9)	0.966 (0.0004)	3.61 (0.008)	-10475.0 (99.6)	0.991 (0.0003)	3.59 (0.008)
R-square	0.2227	0.2083	0.2703	0.2404	0.2233	0.2707
Sample Size	372044	327044	329081	372044	327044	329081

Note: The sample consists of black and white men aged 18-62. The black males are taken from the 5 percent Public Use Sample of the 1980 Census. The white males are taken from the 1 percent Public Use Sample of the 1980 Census.

Regressions with log earnings per week include only those for whom wages and weeks were strictly greater than zero.

* The standard errors have been corrected for arbitrary forms of heteroskedasticity.

Table V
Oaxaca Decompositions
Differences Relative to
Native Born Black Non-Movers

		Overall Difference (Sum)	Difference Predicted on Basis of Endowments	Difference Predicted on Basis of Coefficients i)constant ii)Other Coeff.	
Group:	Dependent Variable:				
Native Black Movers	Annual Earnings	-2449.11	-1023.24	1710.3	-3136.17
	Whether Employed	-0.03198	-0.00998	-0.1644	0.1424
	Log Earnings Per Week	-0.0052	-0.09742	-0.08167	0.1739
All Black Immigrants	Annual Earnings	101.6	-1110.2	151.2	1060.6
	Whether Employed	-0.04359	-0.03429	-0.156	0.1467
	Log Earnings Per Week	0.03095	-0.09892	-0.17833	0.3082
Jamaicans	Annual Earnings	-952.8	-855	383.6	-481.4
	Whether Employed	-0.0734	-0.01293	-0.26207	0.2016
	Log Earnings Per Week	-0.04105	-0.08136	-0.15252	0.19283

-continued-

Table V Continued
Oaxaca Decompositions
Differences Relative to
Native Born Black Non-Movers

		Overall Difference (Sum)	Difference Predicted on Basis of Endowments	Difference on Basis of i)constant	Predicted Coefficients ii)Other Coeff.
Carribeans	Annual Earnings	-73.8	-944.8	-546.5	1417.5
	Whether Employed	-0.0451	-0.02025	-0.1724	0.14755
	Log Earnings Per Week	0.032515	-0.09666	-0.28751	0.416685
Africans	Annual Earnings	4009.5	-1695	8882.2	-3177.7
	Whether Employed	0.08045	-0.09609	0.2038	-0.02726
	Log Earnings Per Week	0.28752	-0.1633	0.56452	-0.1137

Data are from the 1980 Census 5 percent Public Use Sample.

Samples include men between the ages of 18 and 62.

Regressions for the Oaxaca Decompositions include as independent variables:
Highest Grade Completed, a dummy for Poor English Ability, Married, Experience,
Experience Squared, a dummy for Southern regions, and a constant term.

Oaxaca Decompositions assume Married, Non-Southern, and Good English Ability.

Table VI
Percent of Immigrants in, and
Average Education of each Cohort

Origin	Year of Immigration Categories:						Fraction with Poor English Ability
	Before 1950	1950-1960	1960-1965	1965-1970	1970-1975	1975-1980	
All Black Immigrants Avg. Educ. of Cohort	4.8 10.8	8.0 12.7	8.5 13.1	20.1 12.9	29.1 12.5	29.6 12.6	0.05 (0.002)
Jamaicans Avg. Educ. of Cohort	3.3 11.2	6.6 12.9	7.0 12.8	24.4 12.2	33.0 11.5	25.8 11.4	0.004 (0.002)
Carribeans Avg. Educ. of Cohort	2.6 11.5	5.7 12.9	9.1 12.7	24.7 12.9	32.1 12.2	25.8 10.9	0.09 (0.005)
Africans Avg. Educ. of Cohort	1.1 14.8	1.9 15.2	4.2 16.8	7.1 16.5	28.5 16.2	57.3 15.3	0.02 (0.003)
Other Black Immigrants Avg. Educ. of Cohort	12.3 12.2	17.6 12.2	11.8 12.8	17.7 12.6	20.9 12.4	19.7 12.1	0.04 (0.0004)
White Immigrants Avg. Educ. of Cohort	15.5 12.5	28.5 12.7	13.2 12.7	13.6 12.1	10.9 12.3	18.4 13.7	0.08 (0.002)
Avg. Educ. of U.S. Comparison Group	8.9	10.7	11.6	12.0	12.4	12.2	

Note: The samples consist of black males aged 18-62 in the 5 percent Public Use Sample of the 1980 Census and white males aged 18-62 in the 1 percent Public Use Sample of the 1980 Census.

Fraction with Poor English Ability is the mean of a dichotomous variable which is equal to 1 if the individual reports that he speaks English poorly or not at all, and is zero otherwise. The standard errors are in parentheses.

Table VII
Cohort Quality
or Assimilation Rates
for Various Black Immigrant Groups

(standard errors in parentheses)

	(1)			(2)		
	Dependent Annual Earnings	Variable: Whether* Employed	Log Earnings per Week	Dependent Annual Earnings	Variable: Whether* Employed	Log Earnings per Week
Mean of Dep. Var.	9058 (19.3)	0.79 (0.0009)	5.32 (0.002)			
Highest Grade	918.5 (6.3)	0.0228 (0.0003)	0.0731 (0.0007)	918.3 (6.3)	0.0228 (0.0003)	0.0731 (0.0007)
High Grade *Immigrant	-332.2 (22.7)	-0.0231 (0.0012)	-0.0258 (0.0026)			
High Grade *Jamaican				-222.6 (49.2)	-0.0216 (0.0025)	-0.0165 (0.0054)
High Grade *Caribbean				-311.1 (36.5)	-0.0192 (0.0019)	-0.0281 (0.0041)
High Grade *African				-232.2 (77.4)	-0.0195 (0.0049)	-0.0149 (0.0091)
High Grade *Other Immigrant				-237.9 (48.9)	-0.0117 (0.0025)	-0.0222 (0.0058)
Years Since Immigration:						
Five Years	4.4 (327.3)	0.1564 (0.0168)	-0.0053 (0.0374)	-513.5 (706.4)	0.0541 (0.0363)	-0.0062 (0.0842)
Ten Years	2715.6 (327.1)	0.3252 (0.0168)	0.1886 (0.0368)	1656.1 (708.9)	0.1605 (0.0364)	0.1741 (0.0824)
Fifteen Years	3870.3 (344.0)	0.3265 (0.0177)	0.2534 (0.0387)	2099.1 (735.9)	0.1510 (0.0378)	0.1491 (0.0861)
Twenty Years	5395.5 (407.2)	0.3459 (0.0209)	0.3297 (0.0454)	3098.9 (793.2)	0.1565 (0.0408)	0.2687 (0.0930)
Thirty Years	3888.0 (405.2)	0.2977 (0.0208)	0.2611 (0.0461)	2510.0 (720.7)	0.1318 (0.0370)	0.1838 (0.0861)
Over Thirty Years	2693.0 (446.2)	0.1871 (0.0229)	0.2791 (0.0535)	760.6 (694.4)	-0.0112 (0.0357)	0.2733 (0.0879)
Five Years *Jamaican				323.6 (960.2)	0.2206 (0.0493)	-0.0143 (0.1098)
Ten Years *Jamaican				841.1 (953.6)	0.1754 (0.0490)	-0.0421 (0.1075)
Fifteen Years *Jamaican				1125.8 (1010.0)	0.1643 (0.0519)	0.0629 (0.1141)
Twenty Years *Jamaican				1116.4 (1203.1)	0.1769 (0.0618)	-0.0737 (0.1342)
Thirty Years *Jamaican				96.4 (1172.1)	0.1685 (0.0602)	-0.0170 (0.1327)
Over Thirty Years *Jamaican				4079.9 (1299.2)	0.3733 (0.0668)	-0.1263 (0.1481)
Five Years *Caribbean				766.8 (844.6)	0.1041 (0.0434)	0.0186 (0.0997)
Ten Years *Caribbean				865.0 (860.3)	0.1292 (0.0442)	0.0309 (0.0986)
Fifteen Years *Caribbean				1335.7 (903.1)	0.1326 (0.0464)	0.1131 (0.1037)

-continued-

Table VII continued

	Annual Earnings	Whether* Employed	Log Earnings per Week	Annual Earnings	Whether* Employed	Log Earnings per Week
Twenty Years *Caribbean				1813.2 (1009.2)	0.1612 (0.0519)	0.0670 (0.1153)
Thirty Years *Caribbean				1496.1 (1013.0)	0.1523 (0.0521)	0.1337 (0.1164)
Over Thirty Years *Caribbean				2898.1 (1143.4)	0.2812 (0.0588)	-0.0057 (0.1339)
Five Years *African				-2437.2 (1398.2)	-0.0971 (0.0719)	-0.2678 (0.1681)
Ten Years *African				-2412.7 (1481.3)	0.0761 (0.0563)	-0.2386 (0.1727)
Fifteen Years *African				410.2 (1647.1)	0.1397 (0.0846)	-0.0292 (0.1892)
Twenty Years *African				5627.9 (1806.0)	0.1829 (0.0928)	0.0797 (0.2072)
Thirty Years *African				-528.5 (1993.9)	0.0985 (0.1025)	-0.0041 (0.2339)
Over Thirty Years *African				-4199.3 (2299.4)	-0.0223 (0.1182)	-0.2495 (0.2937)
Poor Eng. Ability	-613.0 (272.4)	-0.0446 (0.0140)	-0.1277 (0.0319)	-625.2 (276.7)	-0.0445 (0.0142)	-0.1229 (0.0322)
Married	4237.6 (36.7)	0.1833 (0.0019)	0.2398 (0.0042)	4235.4 (36.6)	0.1829 (0.0019)	0.2399 (0.0042)
Experience	490.5 (4.7)	0.0054 (0.0002)	0.0442 (0.0006)	489.7 (4.7)	0.0053 (0.0002)	0.0442 (0.0006)
Experience Squared	-8.0 (0.1)	-0.0002 (0.000005)	-0.0006 (0.00001)	-8.0 (0.1)	-0.0002 (0.000005)	-0.0006 (0.00001)
South	-1325.8 (35.5)	0.0342 (0.0018)	-0.1927 (0.0040)	-1316.1 (35.5)	0.0351 (0.0018)	-0.1925 (0.0040)
Intercept	-7878.1 (91.1)	0.4040 (0.0047)	3.9257 (0.0109)	-7871.3 (91.1)	0.4046 (0.0047)	3.9260 (0.0109)
R-Square	0.2570	0.1055	0.1739	0.2576	0.1067	0.1741
Sample Size	203956	203956	158416	203956	203956	158416
F-test for exclusion of all immigrant and immigrant interactions.	156	107	70	45	37	19
Schwartz Criterion	12.23	12.23	11.97			

From 1980 Census 5 percent Public Use Sample.

Sample includes black men between the ages of 18 and 62.

Regressions with log earnings per week include only those for whom wages and weeks worked were strictly greater than zero.

* The standard errors have been corrected for arbitrary forms of heteroskedasticity.

Table VIII
Cohort Quality
or Assimilation Rates
for White Immigrants

(standard errors in parentheses)

	(1)			(2)		
	Dependent Variable: Annual Earnings	Whether* Employed	Log Earnings per Week	Dependent Variable: Annual Earnings	Whether* Employed	Log Earnings per Week
Mean of Dependent Var.	14404 (30.3)	0.93 (0.0006)	5.639 (0.002)			
Highest Grade	1149.4 (9.4)	0.007 (0.0003)	0.064 (0.001)	1159.3 (9.6)	0.008 (0.0003)	0.065 (0.001)
Highest Grade * Immigrant				-192.6 (39.2)	-0.010 (0.001)	-0.016 (0.003)
Years Since Immigration:						
Five Years	-2919.0 (358.9)	-0.191 (0.008)	-0.097 (0.026)	-183.5 (662.6)	-0.054 (0.012)	0.132 (0.045)
Ten Years	232.6 (460.3)	-0.006 (0.006)	-0.019 (0.030)	2706.4 (682.3)	0.118 (0.011)	0.189 (0.046)
Fifteen Years	1345.9 (410.3)	0.011 (0.005)	0.061 (0.027)	3745.4 (638.0)	0.131 (0.010)	0.263 (0.043)
Twenty Years	1286.8 (415.0)	0.010 (0.005)	0.070 (0.027)	3766.4 (653.6)	0.134 (0.010)	0.281 (0.044)
Thirty Years	984.8 (283.1)	0.015 (0.004)	0.067 (0.019)	3457.0 (577.5)	0.139 (0.010)	0.277 (0.039)
Over Thirty Years	1470.9 (383.9)	-0.002 (0.006)	0.085 (0.026)	3897.2 (625.6)	0.120 (0.011)	0.293 (0.043)
Poor English Ability	-214.0 (432.3)	0.009 (0.010)	-0.061 (0.029)	-795.8 (448.2)	-0.020 (0.010)	-0.111 (0.031)
Married	4320.2 (65.9)	0.081 (0.002)	0.258 (0.004)	4313.6 (65.9)	0.080 (0.002)	0.258 (0.004)
Experience	853.2 (8.2)	0.003 (0.0002)	0.057 (0.001)	854.0 (8.2)	0.003 (0.0002)	0.057 (0.001)
Experience Squared	-15.9 (0.18)	-0.0001 (0.0000)	-0.0010 (0.0000)	-15.9 (0.2)	-0.0001 (0.0000)	-0.001 (0.0000)
South	-1144.4 (58.5)	-0.015 (0.001)	-0.097 (0.004)	-1135.3 (58.5)	-0.014 (0.001)	-0.096 (0.004)
Intercept	-10486.7 (144.8)	0.810 (0.004)	4.118 (0.010)	-10619.5 (147.3)	0.804 (0.004)	4.106 (0.010)
R-Square	0.2118	0.0714	0.2297	0.2119	0.0721	0.2299
Sample Size	168088	168088	156409	168088	168088	156409

From the 1980 Census 1 percent Public Use Sample.

Sample includes white men between the ages of 18 and 62.

Regressions with log earnings per week include only those for whom wages and weeks were strictly greater than zero.

*These standard errors are corrected for arbitrary forms of heteroskedasticity.